

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment and RCE

In response to the Final Rejection of October 18, 2005, Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal and one month extension of time. Applicants have now decided to withdraw the appeal and are filing a RCE herewith. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the RCE and this amendment be entered, and prosecution continued for this application.

Conditional Extension of Time

Applicants do not believe that an extension of time is necessary to file this Amendment and RCE. However, if such an extension of time is required, Applicants are filing a conditional extension of time. Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any fee due for the extension of time.

Amendment to Claims

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 to recite that each of the pixels comprises at least first and second thin film transistors and a pixel electrode wherein a gate electrode of the first thin film transistor is electrically connected to a gate line and a gate electrode of the second thin film transistor is electrically connected to a drain region of the first thin film transistor, and the pixel electrode is electrically connected to one of source and drain regions of the second thin film transistor.¹ This feature is supported, for example, in Embodiment Mode 18 (see e.g. pages 55-58; Figs. 34 and 35) of the present application.

¹ Applicants are also making minor amendments to independent Claims 2, 6 and 8 to correct informalities therein. These amendments are not in response to a patentability rejection and do not affect the scope of the claims.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 29 and 36

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 29 and 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. (US 5,673,061) in view of Matsueda et al. (US 6,380,917). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, independent Claims 1 and 5 require that each of the pixels comprises at least first and second thin film transistors and a pixel electrode wherein a gate electrode of the first thin film transistor is electrically connected to a gate line and a gate electrode of the second thin film transistor is electrically connected to a drain region of the first thin film transistor, and the pixel electrode is electrically connected to one of source and drain regions of the second thin film transistor. It is respectfully submitted that neither Okada nor Matsueda disclose or suggest this feature. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 5 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, 26, 30, 33 and 37

The Examiner further rejects Claims 2, 6, 26, 30, 33 and 37 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. in view of Matsueda et al. and further in view of Yasunishi (US 6,094,243). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner admits that Okada and Matsueda do not describe k subframes having 2^k levels but alleges that Yasunishi teaches dividing a period T into k subframes with 2^k levels. The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to

combine k subframes with 2^k levels into the display device of Okada to produce a display device that has each frame imaging comprising 2^{m-n} subframes. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent Claims 2 and 6 recite that one frame period comprises 2^{m-n} subframe periods. Claim 6 further defines an image gray scale of $2^m - (2^{m-n} - 1)$ patterns.

In contrast, Yasunishi discloses k subframes with a gray scale level of 2^k (see col. 8, lns. 44-67). Hence, the relation of the number of gray scales and the number of subframes of the claimed invention is very different than what is disclosed in Yasunishi, and Yasunishi does not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 2 and 6. Accordingly, independent Claims 2 and 6 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35 and 39

The Examiner further rejects Claims 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35 and 39 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al., Matsueda et al, Yasunishi and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,335,716). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For similar reasons as explained above for Claims 2 and 6, neither Okada, Matsueda, Yasunishi, nor Yamazaki disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 3, 4 and 8.

Therefore, independent Claims 3, 4, 8 and those claimed dependent thereon are patentable over these cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn

Claims 7, 31 and 38

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7, 31 and 38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. in view of Matsueda et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al.

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12-17, 40-74, 76-82 and 89-152

The Examiner further rejects Claims 12-17, 40-74, 76-82 and 89-152 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. or Holmes et al, or Kimura, or Munyan, or Stambolic et al., or Kleinschmidt et al., or Sato, or Yui et al. in view of Okada et al. and Matsueda et al. or Okada et al., Matsueda et al., and Yasunishi or Okada et al., Matsueda et al. Yasunishi and Yamazaki or of Okada et al., Matsueda, and Yamazaki. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 19-25

The Examiner further rejects Claims 9 and 19-25 under 35 USC §103(a) are rejected as being unpatentable over Okada et al., and Matsueda et al, or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., and Yasunishi, or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., Yasunishi, and Yamazaki, or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., and Yamazaki and further in view of Wu et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 84-88 and 153

Claims 18, 84-88 and 153 under 35 USC §103(a) are rejected as being unpatentable over Okada et al., Matsueda et al, or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., and Yasunishi or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., Yasunishi, and Yamazaki or of Okada et al., Matsueda et al., and Yamazaki and further in view of Bhargava. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the §103 rejections has been overcome.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.


Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee for this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

April 18, 2005


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No.: 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568